Scott Edward Cole, Esq. (S.B. #160744)
Laura Grace Van Note, Esq. (S.B. #310160)
Cody Alexander Bolce, Esq. (S.B. #322725)
COLE & VAN NOTE
555 12th Street, Suite 1725
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 891-9800
Facsimile: (510) 891-7030
Email: sec@colevannote.com
Email: lvn@colevannote.com
Email: cab@colevannote.com
Web: www.colevannote.com

Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Classes

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ULYSSES NAVARRO, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CLINIVATE, LLC, DON LOMAS, and STEVE TERUI,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-05177-FWS-PVC

CLASS ACTION

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, INJUNCTIVE AND EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR:

1. **NEGLIGENCE;**
2. **CONFIDENTIALITY OF MEDICAL INFORMATION ACT (CAL. CIV. CODE §56);**
3. **BREACH OF IMPLIED CONTRACT;**
4. **UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES;**

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

Representative Plaintiff alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Representative Plaintiff Ulysses Navarro ("Representative Plaintiff") brings this class action against Defendants Clinivate, LLC ("Clinivate"), Don Lomas ("Lomas"), and Steve Terui ("Terui") (collectively "Defendants") for their failure to properly secure and safeguard Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' personally identifiable information stored within Defendant Clinivate's information network, including, without limitation, medical information, such as information regarding medical treatments, provider names, dates of service, diagnosis/procedure information, (these types of information, *inter alia*, being hereafter referred to, collectively, as "personal health information" or "PHI"),[1] account and/or record numbers, names, and dates of birth (these latter types of information, *inter alia*, being hereafter referred to, collectively, as "personally identifiable information" or "PII").[2]

2. With this action, Representative Plaintiff seeks to hold Defendants responsible for the harms they caused and will continue to cause Representative Plaintiff and the countless other similarly situated persons in the massive and preventable cyberattack beginning as early as March 12, 2022 and discovered by Defendant Clinivate on May 25, 2022, by which cybercriminals infiltrated Defendants' inadequately protected network servers and accessed highly sensitive

[1] Personal health information ("PHI") is a category of information that refers to an individual's medical records and history, which is protected under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. *Inter alia*, PHI includes test results, procedure descriptions, diagnoses, personal or family medical histories and data points applied to a set of demographic information for a particular patient.

[2] Personally identifiable information ("PII") generally incorporates information that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity, either alone or when combined with other personal or identifying information. 2 C.F.R. § 200.79. At a minimum, it includes all information that on its face expressly identifies an individual. PII also is generally defined to include certain identifiers that do not on its face name an individual, but that are considered to be particularly sensitive and/or valuable if in the wrong hands (for example, Social Security numbers, passport numbers, driver's license numbers, financial account numbers).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

PHI/PII and financial information which was being kept unprotected (the "Data Breach").

3. Representative Plaintiff further seeks to hold Defendants responsible for not ensuring that the PHI/PII was maintained in a manner consistent with industry, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPPA") Privacy Rule (45 CFR, Parts 160 and 164(A) and (E)), the HIPPA Security Rule (45 CFR, Parts 160 and 164(A) and (C)), and other relevant standards.

4. While Defendants claim to have discovered the breach as early as May 25, 2022, Defendants did not begin informing victims of the Data Breach until July 2022. Indeed, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members were wholly unaware of the Data Breach until they received letters from Defendants informing them of it. In particular, the letter Representative Plaintiff received was dated July 22, 2022.

5. Defendants acquired, collected, and stored Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and/or financial information in their ordinary course of business. Therefore, at all relevant times, Defendants knew, or should have known, that Representative Plaintiff and Class Members would use Defendants' network to store and/or share sensitive data, including highly confidential PHI/PII.

6. HIPAA establishes national minimum standards for the protection of individuals' medical records and other personal health information. HIPAA, generally, applies to health plans/insurers, health care clearinghouses, and those health care providers that conduct certain health care transactions electronically, and sets minimum standards for Defendants' maintenance of Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII. More specifically, HIPAA requires appropriate safeguards be maintained by organizations such as Clinivate to protect the privacy of personal health information and sets limits and conditions on the uses and disclosures that may be made of such information without customer/patient authorization. HIPAA also establishes a series of rights over Representative

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII, including rights to examine and obtain copies of their health records, and to request corrections thereto.

7. Additionally, the HIPAA Security Rule establishes national standards to protect individuals' electronic personal health information that is created, received, used, or maintained by a covered entity. The HIPAA Security Rule requires appropriate administrative, physical, and technical safeguards to ensure the confidentiality, integrity, and security of electronic protected health information.

8. By obtaining, collecting, using, and deriving a benefit from Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII, Defendants assumed legal and equitable duties to those individuals. These duties arise from HIPAA and other state and federal statutes and regulations as well as common law principles. Representative Plaintiff does not bring claims in this action for direct violations of HIPAA, but charges Defendants with various legal violations merely predicated upon the duties set forth in HIPAA.

9. Defendants disregarded the rights of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members by intentionally, willfully, recklessly, or negligently failing to take and implement adequate and reasonable measures to ensure that Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII was safeguarded, failing to take available steps to prevent an unauthorized disclosure of data, and failing to follow applicable, required, and appropriate protocols, policies, and procedures regarding the encryption of data, even for internal use. As a result, the PHI/PII of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members was compromised through disclosure to an unknown and unauthorized third party—an undoubtedly nefarious third party that seeks to profit off this disclosure by defrauding Representative Plaintiff and Class Members in the future. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have a continuing interest in ensuring that their information is and remains safe, and they are entitled to injunctive and other equitable relief.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1332 (diversity jurisdiction). Specifically, this Court has subject matter and diversity jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) because this is a class action where the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $5 million, exclusive of interest and costs, there are more than 100 members in the proposed class, and at least one other Class Member is a citizen of a state different from Defendants.

11. Supplemental jurisdiction to adjudicate issues pertaining to California state law is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1367.

12. Defendants routinely conduct business in California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, and have intentionally availed themselves of this jurisdiction by marketing and selling products and services, and by accepting and processing payments for those products and services within California.

13. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the events that gave rise to Representative Plaintiff's claims took place within the Central District of California, and Defendants do business in this Judicial District.

PLAINTIFF

14. Representative Plaintiff is an adult individual and, at all relevant times herein, a resident of the State of California. Representative Plaintiff is a victim of the Data Breach.

15. Defendants received highly sensitive personal, medical, and financial information from Representative Plaintiff in connection with his receipt of medical care and related medical and/or behavioral health services from one of Defendants' clients, Special Service for Groups, a non-profit health and human service organization for which Clinivate is the electronic health records vendor.[3]

[3] See Defendants' Notice of Data Breach letter, dated July 22, 2022; ssg.org.

16. Representative Plaintiff received—and was a "consumer" for purposes of obtaining—medical care from Defendants within the State of California.

17. At all times herein relevant, Representative Plaintiff is and was a member of each of the Classes.

18. As required in order to obtain services from Defendants, Representative Plaintiff provided Defendants with highly sensitive personal, financial, health, and insurance information.

19. Representative Plaintiff's PHI/PII was exposed in the Data Breach because Defendants stored and/or shared Representative Plaintiff's PHI/PII and financial information. His PHI/PII and financial information was within the possession and control of Defendants at the time of the Data Breach.

20. Representative Plaintiff received a letter from Defendant, dated July 22, 2022, informing him that his PHI/PII and/or financial information was involved in the Data Breach (the "Notice").

21. As a result, Representative Plaintiff spent time dealing with the consequences of the Data Breach, which included and continues to include, time spent verifying the legitimacy and impact of the Data Breach, exploring credit monitoring and identity theft insurance options, self-monitoring his accounts, and seeking legal counsel regarding his options for remedying and/or mitigating the effects of the Data Breach. This time has been lost forever and cannot be recaptured.

22. Representative Plaintiff suffered actual injury in the form of damages to and diminution in the value of his PHI/PII—a form of intangible property that he entrusted to Defendant, which was compromised in and as a result of the Data Breach.

23. Representative Plaintiff suffered lost time, annoyance, interference, and inconvenience as a result of the Data Breach and has anxiety and increased concerns for the loss of his privacy, as well as anxiety over the impact of cybercriminals accessing and using his PHI/PII and/or financial information.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

24. Representative Plaintiff has suffered imminent and impending injury arising from the substantially increased risk of fraud, identity theft, and misuse resulting from his PHI/PII and financial information, in combination with his name, being placed in the hands of unauthorized third parties/criminals.

25. Representative Plaintiff has a continuing interest in ensuring that his PHI/PII and financial information, which, upon information and belief, remains backed up in Defendants' possession, is protected and safeguarded from future breaches.

DEFENDANT

26. Clinivate is a California corporation with a principal place of business located at 99 South. Lake Avenue, Suite 17 Pasadena, California 91101.

27. Clinivate creates software solutions for behavioral health providers, clinicians, and managers. Clinivate is the electronic health records vendor for one such health provider, Special Service for Groups,[4] a non-profit health and human service organization.[5] Recognizing the need for software necessary to today's behavioral health agencies, Clinivate is "a company dedicated to creating easy-to-use, flexible, yet powerful tools for the documentation, tracking, and management of behavioral healthcare services."[6]

28. Defendants Don Lomas and Steve Terui are the two founders of Clinivate, LLC.[7] Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Lomas and Terui are the owners of Clinivate, LLC (i.e., the shareholders).

29. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Clinivate is/was inadequately capitalized and, therefore, its owners are liable for its debts and liabilities in their individual capacities.

[4] See Defendants' Notice of Data Breach letter, dated July 22, 2022.
[5] See Ssg.org
[6] See https://clinivate.com/?page_id=55
[7] See https://clinivate.com/clinivate-dot-com/?page_id=55 (last accessed November 16, 2022).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

30. The true names and capacities of persons or entities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, who may be responsible for some of the claims alleged here are currently unknown to Representative Plaintiff. Representative Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of such other responsible parties when their identities become known.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

31. Representative Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to the provisions of Rules 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of himself and the following classes/subclass(es) (collectively, the "Class"):

> **Nationwide Class:**
> "All individuals within the United States of America whose PHI/PII and/or financial information was exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the data breach occurring between March 12, 2022 and March 21, 2022."
>
> **California Subclass:**
> "All individuals within the State of California whose PII/PHI was exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the data breach occurring between March 12, 2022 and March 21, 2022."

32. Excluded from the Classes are the following individuals and/or entities: Clinivate and Clinivate's parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, and directors, and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest; all individuals who make a timely election to be excluded from this proceeding using the correct protocol for opting out; any and all federal, state, or local governments, including but not limited to their departments, agencies, divisions, bureaus, boards, sections, groups, counsels, and/or subdivisions; and all judges assigned to hear any aspect of this litigation, as well as their immediate family members.

33. Also, in the alternative, Representative Plaintiff requests additional Subclasses as necessary based on the types of PII/PHI that were compromised.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

34. Representative Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the above definition or to propose subclasses in subsequent pleadings and motions for class certification.

35. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and membership in the proposed classes is easily ascertainable.

a. Numerosity: A class action is the only available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The members of the Plaintiff Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical, if not impossible. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that the total number of Class Members is in the hundreds of thousands of individuals. Membership in the classes will be determined by analysis of Defendants' records.

b. Commonality: Representative Plaintiff and the Class Members share a community of interests in that there are numerous common questions and issues of fact and law which predominate over any questions and issues solely affecting individual members, including, but not necessarily limited to:

1) Whether Defendants have a legal duty to Representative Plaintiff and the Classes to exercise due care in collecting, storing, using, and/or safeguarding their PII/PHI;

2) Whether Defendants knew or should have known of the susceptibility of their data security systems to a data breach;

3) Whether Defendants' security procedures and practices to protect their systems were reasonable in light of the measures recommended by data security experts;

4) Whether Defendants' failure to implement adequate data security measures allowed the Data Breach to occur;

5) Whether Defendants failed to comply with their own policies and applicable laws, regulations, and industry standards relating to data security;

6) Whether Defendants adequately, promptly, and accurately informed Representative Plaintiff and Class Members that their PII/PHI had been compromised;

7) How and when Defendants actually learned of the Data Breach;

8) Whether Defendants' conduct, including their failure to act, resulted in or was the proximate cause of the breach of its

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

systems, resulting in the loss of the PII/PHI of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

9) Whether Defendants adequately addressed and fixed the vulnerabilities which permitted the Data Breach to occur;

10) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair, unlawful, or deceptive practices by failing to safeguard the PII/PHI of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

11) Whether Representative Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to actual and/or statutory damages and/or whether injunctive, corrective, and/or declaratory relief and/or an accounting is/are appropriate as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct;

12) Whether Representative Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

c. Typicality: Representative Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Plaintiff Classes. Representative Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff Classes sustained damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of law, as alleged herein.

d. Adequacy of Representation: Representative Plaintiff in this class action is an adequate representative of each of the Plaintiff Classes in that Representative Plaintiff has the same interest in the litigation of this case as the Class Members, is committed to vigorous prosecution of this case and has retained competent counsel who are experienced in conducting litigation of this nature. Representative Plaintiff is not subject to any individual defenses unique from those conceivably applicable to other Class Members or the classes in their entirety. Representative Plaintiff anticipates no management difficulties in this litigation.

e. Superiority of Class Action: Since the damages suffered by individual Class Members, while not inconsequential, may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation by each member makes or may make it impractical for members of the Plaintiff Classes to seek redress individually for the wrongful conduct alleged herein. Should separate actions be brought or be required to be brought, by each individual member of the Plaintiff classes, the resulting multiplicity of lawsuits would cause undue hardship and expense for the Court and the litigants. The prosecution of separate actions would also create a risk of inconsistent rulings which might be dispositive of the interests of other Class Members who are not parties to the adjudications and/or may substantially impede their ability to adequately protect their interests.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

36. This class action is also appropriate for certification because Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Class Members, thereby requiring the Court's imposition of uniform relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the Class Members and making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Class(es) in its/their entirety. Defendants' policies and practices challenged herein apply to and affect Class Members uniformly and Representative Plaintiff's challenge of these policies and practices hinges on Defendants' conduct with respect to the Class(es) in their entirety, not on facts or law applicable only to Representative Plaintiff.

37. Unless a Class-wide injunction is issued, Defendants may continue in their failure to properly secure the PHI/PII and/or financial information of Class Members, and Defendants may continue to act unlawfully as set forth in this Complaint.

38. Further, Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes and, accordingly, final injunctive or corresponding declaratory relief with regard to the Class Members as a whole is appropriate under Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

The Cyberattack

39. In the course of the Data Breach, one or more unauthorized third parties accessed Class Members' sensitive data including, but not limited to, medical information, account or record information, names, and dates of birth. Representative Plaintiff was among the individuals whose data was accessed in the Data Breach.

40. Representative Plaintiff was provided the information detailed above upon his receipt of a letter from Defendant, dated July 22, 2022. He was not aware of the Data Breach until receiving that letter.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Defendants' Failed Response to the Breach

41. Not until roughly nine months after they claim to have discovered the Data Breach did Defendants begin sending the Notice to persons whose PHI/PII and/or financial information Defendants confirmed was potentially compromised as a result of the Data Breach. The Notice provided basic details of the Data Breach and Defendant's recommended next steps.

42. The Notice included, *inter alia*, claims that Defendant Clinivate had "identified unusual activity on certain systems within its network" on September 26, 2021, had taken steps to respond, and was continuing to investigate. It claimed that Defendants took measures to contain the attack and engaged outside cyber security experts to aid its investigation.

43. Upon information and belief, the unauthorized third-party cybercriminals gained access to Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information with the intent of engaging in misuse of the PHI/PII and financial information, including marketing and selling Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII.

44. Defendants had and continue to have obligations created by HIPAA, the California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act ("CMIA"), reasonable industry standards, common law, state statutory law, and their own assurances and representations to keep Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII confidential and to protect such PHI/PII from unauthorized access.

45. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members were required to provide their PHI/PII and financial information to Defendants with the reasonable expectation and mutual understanding that Defendants would comply with their obligations to keep such information confidential and secure from unauthorized access.

46. Despite this, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members remain, even today, in the dark regarding what particular data was stolen, the particular malware

used, and what steps are being taken, if any, to secure their PHI/PII and financial information going forward. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members are left to speculate as to the full impact of the Data Breach and how exactly Defendants intend to enhance their information security systems and monitoring capabilities so as to prevent further breaches.

47. Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information may end up for sale on the dark web, or simply fall into the hands of companies that will use the detailed PHI/PII and financial information for targeted marketing without the approval of Representative Plaintiff and/or Class Members. Either way, unauthorized individuals can now easily access the PHI/PII and/or financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

Defendants Collected/Stored Class Members' PHI/PII

48. Defendants acquired, collected, and stored, and assured reasonable security over, Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information.

49. As a condition of their relationships with Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, Defendants required that Representative Plaintiff and Class Members entrust Defendants with highly sensitive and confidential PHI/PII and financial information. Defendants, in turn, stored that information on their system that was ultimately affected by the Data Breach.

50. By obtaining, collecting, and storing Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information, Defendants assumed legal and equitable duties and knew, or should have known, that they were thereafter responsible for protecting Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information from unauthorized disclosure.

51. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have taken reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of their PHI/PII and financial information.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Representative Plaintiff and Class Members relied on Defendants to keep their PHI/PII and financial information confidential and securely maintained, to use this information for business and healthcare purposes only, and to make only authorized disclosures of this information.

52. Defendants could have prevented the Data Breach by properly securing and encrypting and/or more securely encrypting their servers generally, as well as Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information.

53. Defendants' negligence in safeguarding Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information is exacerbated by repeated warnings and alerts directed to protecting and securing sensitive data, as evidenced by the trending data breach attacks in recent years.

54. The healthcare industry in particular has experienced a large number of high-profile cyberattacks even in just the short period preceding the filing of this Complaint and cyberattacks, generally, have become increasingly more common. More healthcare data breaches were reported in 2020 than in any other year, showing a 25% increase.[8] Additionally, according to the HIPAA Journal, the largest healthcare data breaches have been reported beginning in April 2021.[9]

55. For example, Universal Health Services experienced a cyberattack on September 29, 2020, that appears similar to the attack on Defendant. As a result of this attack, Universal Health Services suffered a four-week outage of its systems which caused as much as $67 million in recovery costs and lost revenue.[10] Similarly, in 2021, Scripps Health suffered a cyberattack, an event which effectively shut down critical health care services for a month and left numerous patients unable to speak

[8] https://www.hipaajournal.com/2020-healthcare-data-breach-report-us/ (last accessed November 5, 2021).
[9] https://www.hipaajournal.com/april-2021-healthcare-data-breach-report/ (last accessed November 5, 2021).
[10] https://ir.uhsinc.com/news-releases/news-release-details/universal-health-services-inc-reports-2020-fourth-quarter-and (last accessed November 5, 2021).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

to their physicians or access vital medical and prescription records.[11] A few months later, University of San Diego Health suffered a similar attack.[12]

56. Due to the high-profile nature of these breaches, and other breaches of its kind, Defendants were and/or certainly should have been on notice and aware of such attacks occurring in the healthcare industry and, therefore, should have assumed and adequately performed the duty of preparing for such an imminent attack.

57. Yet, despite the prevalence of public announcements of data breach and data security compromises, Defendants failed to take appropriate steps to protect Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information from being compromised.

Defendants Had an Obligation to Protect the Stolen Information

58. Defendants owe an implied duty to Plaintiffs and Class Members' to adequately secure Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' sensitive data from breach under statutory and common law. Under HIPAA, covered entities and business associates have an affirmative duty to keep patients' Protected Health Information private. As a covered entity, Defendants have a statutory duty under HIPAA, and other federal and state statutes, to safeguard Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' data. Moreover, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members surrendered their highly sensitive personal data to Defendants under the implied condition that Defendants would keep it private and secure. Accordingly, Defendants also have an implied duty to safeguard their data, independent of any statute.

[11] https://www.nbcsandiego.com/news/local/scripps-health-employees-regaining-access-to-internal-systems-hit-by-cyberattack-2/2619540/ (last accessed November 5, 2021).

[12] https://www.nbcsandiego.com/news/local/data-breach-at-uc-san-diego-health-some-employee-email-accounts-impacted/2670302/ (last accessed November 5, 2021).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

59. Because Clinivate is covered by HIPAA (45 C.F.R. § 160.102), it is required to comply with the HIPAA Privacy Rule, 45 C.F.R. Part 160 and Part 164, Subparts A and E ("Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information"), and Security Rule ("Security Standards for the Protection of Electronic Protected Health Information"), 45 C.F.R. Part 160 and Part 164, Subparts A and C.

60. HIPAA's Privacy Rule or Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information establishes national standards for the protection of health information.

61. HIPAA's Privacy Rule or Security Standards for the Protection of Electronic Protected Health Information establishes a national set of security standards for protecting health information that is kept or transferred in electronic form.

62. HIPAA requires Clinivate to "comply with the applicable standards, implementation specifications, and requirements" of HIPAA "with respect to electronic protected health information." 45 C.F.R. § 164.302.

63. "Electronic protected health information" is "individually identifiable health information … that is (i) transmitted by electronic media; maintained in electronic media." 45 C.F.R. § 160.103.

64. HIPAA's Security Rule requires Clinivate to do the following:

a. Ensure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of all electronic protected health information the covered entity or business associate creates, receives, maintains, or transmits;

b. Protect against any reasonably anticipated threats or hazards to the security or integrity of such information;

c. Protect against any reasonably anticipated uses or disclosures of such information that are not permitted; and

d. Ensure compliance by its workforce.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

65. HIPAA also requires Clinivate to "review and modify the security measures implemented … as needed to continue provision of reasonable and appropriate protection of electronic protected health information" under 45 C.F.R. § 164.306(e), and to "[i]mplement technical policies and procedures for electronic information systems that maintain electronic protected health information to allow access only to those persons or software programs that have been granted access rights." 45 C.F.R. § 164.312(a)(1).

66. Moreover, the HIPAA Breach Notification Rule, 45 C.F.R. §§ 164.400-414, requires Clinivate to provide notice of the Data Breach to each affected individual "without unreasonable delay and in no case later than 60 days following discovery of the breach."

67. Defendants were also prohibited by the Federal Trade Commission Act (the "FTC Act") (15 U.S.C. § 45) from engaging in "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce." The Federal Trade Commission (the "FTC") has concluded that a company's failure to maintain reasonable and appropriate data security for consumers' sensitive personal information is an "unfair practice" in violation of the FTC Act. See, e.g., *FTC v. Wyndham Worldwide Corp*., 799 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2015).

68. In addition to their obligations under federal and state laws, Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to exercise reasonable care in obtaining, retaining, securing, safeguarding, deleting, and protecting the PHI/PII and financial information in Defendants' possession from being compromised, lost, stolen, accessed, and/or misused by unauthorized persons. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to provide reasonable security, including consistency with industry standards and requirements, and to ensure that their computer systems, networks, and protocols adequately protected the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

69. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to design, maintain, and test their computer systems, servers, and networks to ensure that the PHI/PII and financial information in their possession was adequately secured and protected.

70. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to create and implement reasonable data security practices and procedures to protect the PHI/PII and financial information in their possession, including not sharing information with other entities who maintained sub-standard data security systems.

71. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to implement processes that would immediately detect a breach on their data security systems in a timely manner.

72. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to act upon data security warnings and alerts in a timely fashion.

73. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to disclose if their computer systems and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard individuals' PHI/PII and/or financial information from theft because such an inadequacy would be a material fact in the decision to entrust this PHI/PII and/or financial information to Defendants.

74. Defendants owed a duty of care to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members because they were foreseeable and probable victims of any inadequate data security practices.

75. Defendants owed a duty to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to encrypt and/or more reliably encrypt Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information and monitor user behavior and activity in order to identify possible threats.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Value of the Relevant Sensitive Information

76. While the greater efficiency of electronic health records translates to cost savings for providers, it also comes with the risk of privacy breaches. These electronic health records contain a plethora of sensitive information (e.g., patient data, patient diagnosis, lab results, RX's, treatment plans, etc.) that is valuable to cyber criminals. One patient's complete record can be sold for hundreds of dollars on the dark web. As such, PHI/PII and financial information are valuable commodities for which a "cyber black market" exists in which criminals openly post stolen payment card numbers, Social Security numbers, and other personal information on a number of underground internet websites. Unsurprisingly, the healthcare industry is at high risk for and acutely affected by cyberattacks.

77. The high value of PHI/PII and financial information to criminals is further evidenced by the prices they will pay through the dark web. Numerous sources cite dark web pricing for stolen identity credentials. For example, personal information can be sold at a price ranging from $40 to $200, and bank details have a price range of $50 to $200.[13] Experian reports that a stolen credit or debit card number can sell for $5 to $110 on the dark web.[14] Criminals can also purchase access to entire company data breaches from $999 to $4,995.[15]

78. Between 2005 and 2019, at least 249 million people were affected by health care data breaches.[16] Indeed, during 2019 alone, over 41 million healthcare

[13] *Your personal data is for sale on the dark web. Here's how much it costs,* Digital Trends, Oct. 16, 2019, *available at*: https://www.digitaltrends.com/computing/personal-data-sold-on-the- dark-web-how-much-it-costs/ (last accessed July 28, 2021).

[14] *Here's How Much Your Personal Information Is Selling for on the Dark Web*, Experian, Dec. 6, 2017, *available at*: https://www.experian.com/blogs/ask-experian/heres-how-much-your-personal-information-is-selling-for-on-the-dark-web/ (last accessed November 5, 2021).

[15] *In the Dark*, VPNOverview, 2019, *available at*: https://vpnoverview.com/privacy/anonymous-browsing/in-the-dark/ (last accessed January 21, 2022).

[16] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7349636/#B5-healthcare-08-00133 (last accessed January 21, 2022).

records were exposed, stolen, or unlawfully disclosed in 505 data breaches.[17] In short, these sorts of data breaches are increasingly common, especially among healthcare systems, which account for 30.03% of overall health data breaches, according to cybersecurity firm Tenable.[18]

79. These criminal activities have and will result in devastating financial and personal losses to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members. For example, it is believed that certain PHI/PII compromised in the 2017 Experian data breach was being used, three years later, by identity thieves to apply for COVID-19-related benefits in the state of Oklahoma. Such fraud will be an omnipresent threat for Representative Plaintiff and Class Members for the rest of their lives. They will need to remain constantly vigilant.

80. The FTC defines identity theft as "a fraud committed or attempted using the identifying information of another person without authority." The FTC describes "identifying information" as "any name or number that may be used, alone or in conjunction with any other information, to identify a specific person," including, among other things, "[n]ame, Social Security number, date of birth, official State or government issued driver's license or identification number, alien registration number, government passport number, employer or taxpayer identification number."

81. Identity thieves can use PHI/PII and financial information, such as that of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members which Defendants failed to keep secure, to perpetrate a variety of crimes that harm victims. For instance, identity thieves may commit various types of government fraud such as immigration fraud, obtaining a driver's license or identification card in the victim's name but with another's picture, using the victim's information to obtain government benefits, or

[17] https://www.hipaajournal.com/december-2019-healthcare-data-breach-report/ (last accessed January 21, 2022).

[18] https://www.tenable.com/blog/healthcare-security-ransomware-plays-a-prominent-role-in-covid-19-era-breaches (last accessed January 21, 2022).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

filing a fraudulent tax return using the victim's information to obtain a fraudulent refund.

82. The ramifications of Defendants' failure to keep secure Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information are long lasting and severe. Once PHI/PII and financial information is stolen, particularly identification numbers, fraudulent use of that information and damage to victims may continue for years. Indeed, the PHI/PII and/or financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members was taken by hackers to engage in identity theft or to sell it to other criminals who will purchase the PHI/PII and/or financial information for that purpose. The fraudulent activity resulting from the Data Breach may not come to light for years.

83. There may be a time lag between when harm occurs versus when it is discovered, and also between when PHI/PII and/or financial information is stolen and when it is used. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office ("GAO"), which conducted a study regarding data breaches:

> [L]aw enforcement officials told us that in some cases, stolen data may be held for up to a year or more before being used to commit identity theft. Further, once stolen data have been sold or posted on the Web, fraudulent use of that information may continue for years. As a result, studies that attempt to measure the harm resulting from data breaches cannot necessarily rule out all future harm.[19]

84. The harm to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members is especially acute given the nature of the leaked data. Medical identity theft is one of the most common, most expensive, and most difficult-to-prevent forms of identity theft. According to Kaiser Health News, "medical-related identity theft accounted for 43 percent of all identity thefts reported in the United States in 2013," which is more

[19] *Report to Congressional Requesters*, GAO, at 29 (June 2007), *available at:* http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07737.pdf (last accessed January 21, 2022).

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

than identity theft involving banking and finance, the government and the military, or education.[20]

85. "Medical identity theft is a growing and dangerous crime that leaves their victims with little to no recourse for recovery," reported Pam Dixon, Executive Director of World Privacy Forum. "Victims often experience financial repercussions and worse yet, they frequently discover erroneous information has been added to their personal medical files due to the thief's activities."[21]

86. If cyber criminals manage to access financial information, health insurance information and other personally sensitive data—as they did here—there is no limit to the amount of fraud to which Defendants may have exposed Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

87. A study by Experian found that the average total cost of medical identity theft is "about $20,000" per incident, and that a majority of victims of medical identity theft were forced to pay out-of-pocket costs for healthcare they did not receive in order to restore coverage.[22] Almost half of medical identity theft victims lose their healthcare coverage as a result of the incident, while nearly one-third saw their insurance premiums rise, and forty percent were never able to resolve their identity theft at all.[23]

88. And data breaches are preventable.[24] As Lucy Thompson wrote in the DATA BREACH AND ENCRYPTION HANDBOOK, "[i]n almost all cases, the data

[20] Michael Ollove, "The Rise of Medical Identity Theft in Healthcare," Kaiser Health News, Feb. 7, 2014, https://khn.org/news/rise-of-indentity-theft/ (last accessed January 21, 2022).
[21] *Id.*
[22] See Elinor Mills, "Study: Medical Identity Theft is Costly for Victims," CNET (Mar, 3, 2010), https://www.cnet.com/news/study-medical-identity-theft-is-costly-for-victims/ (last accessed January 21, 2022).
[23] Id.; see also Healthcare Data Breach: What to Know About them and What to Do After One, EXPERIAN, https://www.experian.com/blogs/ask-experian/healthcare-data-breach-what-to-know-about-them-and-what-to-do-after-one/ (last accessed January 21, 2022).
[24] Lucy L. Thompson, "Despite the Alarming Trends, Data Breaches Are Preventable," *in* DATA BREACH AND ENCRYPTION HANDBOOK (Lucy Thompson, ed., 2012)

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

breaches that occurred could have been prevented by proper planning and the correct design and implementation of appropriate security solutions."[25] She added that "[o]rganizations that collect, use, store, and share sensitive personal data must accept responsibility for protecting the information and ensuring that it is not compromised . . . ."[26]

89. Most of the reported data breaches are a result of lax security and the failure to create or enforce appropriate security policies, rules, and procedures … Appropriate information security controls, including encryption, must be implemented and enforced in a rigorous and disciplined manner so that a *data breach never occurs*."[27]

90. Here, Defendants knew of the importance of safeguarding PHI/PII and financial information and of the foreseeable consequences that would occur if Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information was stolen, including the significant costs that would be placed on Representative Plaintiff and Class Members as a result of a breach of this magnitude. Defendants knew, or should have known, that the development and use of such protocols were necessary to fulfill their statutory and common law duties to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members. Their failure to do so is, therefore, intentional, willful, reckless, and/or grossly negligent.

91. Defendants disregarded the rights of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members by, *inter alia*, (i) intentionally, willfully, recklessly, or negligently failing to take adequate and reasonable measures to ensure that their network servers were protected against unauthorized intrusions; (ii) failing to disclose that they did not have adequately robust security protocols and training practices in place to adequately safeguard Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and/or financial information; (iii) failing to take standard and reasonably available steps to

[25] *Id.* at 17.
[26] *Id.* at 28.
[27] *Id.*

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

prevent the Data Breach; (iv) concealing the existence and extent of the Data Breach for an unreasonable duration of time; and (v) failing to provide Representative Plaintiff and Class Members prompt and accurate notice of the Data Breach.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Negligence
(On behalf of the Nationwide Class)

92. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

93. At all times herein relevant, Defendants owed Representative Plaintiff and Class Members a duty of care, *inter alia*, to act with reasonable care to secure and safeguard their PHI/PII and financial information and to use commercially reasonable methods to do so. Defendants took on this obligation upon accepting and storing the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members in their computer systems and on their networks.

94. Among these duties, Defendants were expected:

a. to exercise reasonable care in obtaining, retaining, securing, safeguarding, deleting, and protecting the PHI/PII and financial information in their possession;

b. to protect Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information using reasonable and adequate security procedures and systems that were/are compliant with industry-standard practices;

c. to implement processes to quickly detect the Data Breach and to timely act on warnings about data breaches; and

d. to promptly notify Representative Plaintiff and Class Members of any data breach, security incident, or intrusion that affected or may have affected their PHI/PII and financial information.

95. Defendants knew that the PHI/PII and financial information was private and confidential and should be protected as private and confidential and, thus, Defendants owed a duty of care not to subject Representative Plaintiff and Class

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Members to an unreasonable risk of harm because they were foreseeable and probable victims of any inadequate security practices.

96. Defendants knew, or should have known, of the risks inherent in collecting and storing PHI/PII and financial information, the vulnerabilities of their data security systems, and the importance of adequate security. Defendants knew about numerous, well-publicized data breaches.

97. Defendants knew, or should have known, that their data systems and networks did not adequately safeguard Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information.

98. Defendants were in the exclusive position to ensure that their systems and protocols were sufficient to protect the PHI/PII and financial information that Representative Plaintiff and Class Members had entrusted to them.

99. Defendants breached their duties to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to provide fair, reasonable, or adequate computer systems and data security practices to safeguard the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

100. Because Defendants knew that a breach of their systems could damage thousands of individuals, including Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, Defendants had a duty to adequately protect their data systems and the PHI/PII and financial information contained thereon.

101. Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' willingness to entrust Defendants with their PHI/PII and financial information was predicated on the understanding that Defendants would take adequate security precautions. Moreover, only Defendants had the ability to protect their systems and the PHI/PII and financial information they stored on them from attack. Thus, Defendants had a special relationship with Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

102. Defendants also had independent duties under state and federal laws that required Defendants to reasonably safeguard Representative Plaintiff's and

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information and promptly notify them about the Data Breach. These "independent duties" are untethered to any contract between Defendants and Representative Plaintiff and/or the remaining Class Members.

103. Defendants breached their general duty of care to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members in, but not necessarily limited to, the following ways:

a. by failing to provide fair, reasonable, or adequate computer systems and data security practices to safeguard the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

b. by failing to timely and accurately disclose that Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information had been improperly acquired or accessed;

c. by failing to adequately protect and safeguard the PHI/PII and financial information by knowingly disregarding standard information security principles, despite obvious risks, and by allowing unmonitored and unrestricted access to unsecured PHI/PII and financial information;

d. by failing to provide adequate supervision and oversight of the PHI/PII and financial information with which they were and are entrusted, in spite of the known risk and foreseeable likelihood of breach and misuse, which permitted an unknown third party to gather PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, misuse the PHI/PII, and intentionally disclose it to others without consent.

e. by failing to adequately train their employees to not store PHI/PII and financial information longer than absolutely necessary;

f. by failing to consistently enforce security policies aimed at protecting Representative Plaintiff's and the Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information;

g. by failing to implement processes to quickly detect data breaches, security incidents, or intrusions; and

h. by failing to encrypt Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information and monitor user behavior and activity in order to identify possible threats.

104. Defendants' willful failure to abide by these duties was wrongful, reckless, and grossly negligent in light of the foreseeable risks and known threats.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

105. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Defendants' grossly negligent conduct, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages and are at imminent risk of additional harms and damages (as alleged above).

106. The law further imposes an affirmative duty on Defendants to timely disclose the unauthorized access and theft of the PHI/PII and financial information to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members so that they could and/or still can take appropriate measures to mitigate damages, protect against adverse consequences, and thwart future misuse of their PHI/PII and financial information.

107. Defendants breached their duty to notify Representative Plaintiff and Class Members of the unauthorized access by waiting months after learning of the Data Breach to notify Representative Plaintiff and Class Members and then by failing and continuing to fail to provide Representative Plaintiff and Class Members sufficient information regarding the breach. To date, Defendants have not provided sufficient information to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members regarding the extent of the unauthorized access and continue to breach their disclosure obligations to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

108. Further, through their failure to provide timely and clear notification of the Data Breach to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, Defendants prevented Representative Plaintiff and Class Members from taking meaningful, proactive steps to secure their PHI/PII and financial information, and to access their medical records and histories.

109. There is a close causal connection between Defendants' failure to implement security measures to protect the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members and the harm suffered, or risk of imminent harm suffered by Representative Plaintiff and Class Members. Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information was accessed as the proximate result of Defendants' failure to exercise reasonable

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

care in safeguarding such PHI/PII and financial information by adopting, implementing, and maintaining appropriate security measures.

110. Defendants' wrongful actions, inactions, and omissions constituted (and continue to constitute) common law negligence.

111. The damages Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered (as alleged above) and will suffer were and are the direct and proximate result of Defendants' grossly negligent conduct.

112. Additionally, 15 U.S.C. § 45 (FTC Act, Section 5) prohibits "unfair . . . practices in or affecting commerce," including, as interpreted and enforced by the FTC, the unfair act or practice by businesses, such as Defendant, of failing to use reasonable measures to protect PHI/PII and financial information. The FTC publications and orders described above also form part of the basis of Defendants' duty in this regard.

113. Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. § 45 by failing to use reasonable measures to protect PHI/PII and financial information and not complying with applicable industry standards, as described in detail herein. Defendants' conduct was particularly unreasonable given the nature and amount of PHI/PII and financial information it obtained and stored and the foreseeable consequences of the immense damages that would result to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

114. Defendants' violation of 15 U.S.C. § 45 constitutes negligence *per se.* Defendants also violated the HIPAA Privacy and Security rules which, likewise, constitutes negligence *per se*.

115. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence and negligence *per se*, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and will suffer injury, including but not limited to: (i) actual identity theft; (ii) the loss of the opportunity of how their PHI/PII and financial information is used; (iii) the compromise, publication, and/or theft of their PHI/PII and financial information; (iv) out-of-pocket expenses associated with the prevention, detection, and recovery from

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

identity theft, tax fraud, and/or unauthorized use of their PHI/PII and financial information; (v) lost opportunity costs associated with effort expended and the loss of productivity addressing and attempting to mitigate the actual and future consequences of the Data Breach, including but not limited to, efforts spent researching how to prevent, detect, contest, and recover from embarrassment and identity theft; (vi) lost continuity in relation to their healthcare; (vii) the continued risk to their PHI/PII and financial information, which may remain in Defendants' possession and is subject to further unauthorized disclosures so long as Defendants fail to undertake appropriate and adequate measures to protect Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information in their continued possession; and (viii) future costs in terms of time, effort, and money that will be expended to prevent, detect, contest, and repair the impact of the PHI/PII and financial information compromised as a result of the Data Breach for the remainder of the lives of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members.

116. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence and negligence *per se*, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and will continue to suffer other forms of injury and/or harm, including, but not limited to, anxiety, emotional distress, loss of privacy, and other economic and non-economic losses.

117. Additionally, as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence and negligence *per se*, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and will suffer the continued risks of exposure of their PHI/PII and financial information, which remain in Defendants' possession and are subject to further unauthorized disclosures, so long as Defendants fail to undertake appropriate and adequate measures to protect the PHI/PII and financial information in their continued possession.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Confidentiality of Medical Information Act
(Cal. Civ. Code §56, *et seq.*)
(On behalf of the California Subclass)

118. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

119. Under California Civil Code § 56.06, Defendants are deemed a "provider of health care, health care service plan, or contractor" and are, therefore, subject to the CMIA, California Civil Code §§ 56.10(a), (d) (e), 56.36(b), 56.101(a) and (b).

120. Under the CMIA, California Civil Code §56.05(k), Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members (except employees of Defendants whose records may have been accessed) are deemed "patients."

121. As defined in the CMIA, California Civil Code § 56.05(j), Defendants disclosed "medical information" to unauthorized persons without obtaining consent, in violation of § 56.10(a). Defendants' misconduct, including failure to adequately detect, protect, and prevent unauthorized disclosure, directly resulted in the unauthorized disclosure of Representative Plaintiff's and California Subclass Members' PHI/PII and financial information to unauthorized persons.

122. Defendants' misconduct, including protecting and preserving the confidential integrity of their patients'/customers' PHI/PII and financial information, resulted in unauthorized disclosure of sensitive and confidential PII that belongs to Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members to unauthorized persons, breaching the confidentiality of that information, thereby violating California Civil Code §§ 56.06 and 56.101(a).

123. As a result of the Data Breach, unauthorized third parties viewed Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' protected medical information.

124. Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members have all been and continue to be harmed as a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Defendants' breach because Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members face, now and in the future, an imminent threat of identity theft, fraud, and for ransom demands. They must now spend time, effort, and money to constantly monitor their accounts and credit to surveil for any fraudulent activity.

125. Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members were injured and have suffered damages, as described above, from Defendants' illegal disclosure and negligent release of their PHI/PII and financial information in violation of Cal. Civ. Code §§ 56.10 and 56.101 and, therefore, seek relief under Civ. Code §§ 56.35 and 56.36, including actual damages, nominal statutory damages of $1,000, punitive damages of $3,000, injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees and costs.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Breach of Implied Contract
(On behalf of the Nationwide Class)

126. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

127. Through their course of conduct, Defendants, Representative Plaintiff, and Class Members entered into implied contracts for Defendants to implement data security adequate to safeguard and protect the privacy of Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PHI/PII and financial information.

128. Defendants required Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to provide and entrust their PHI/PII and financial information, including medical information, record or account numbers, names, and dates of birth.

129. Defendants solicited and invited Representative Plaintiff and Class Members to provide their PHI/PII and financial information as part of Defendants' regular business practices. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members accepted Defendants' offers and provided their PHI/PII and financial information to Defendants.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

130. As a condition of being direct customers/patients of Defendants, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members provided and entrusted their PHI/PII and financial information to Defendants. In so doing, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members entered into implied contracts with Defendants by which Defendants agreed to safeguard and protect such non-public information, to keep such information secure and confidential, and to timely and accurately notify Representative Plaintiff and Class Members if their data had been breached and compromised or stolen.

131. A meeting of the minds occurred when Representative Plaintiff and Class Members agreed to, and did, provide their PHI/PII and financial information to Defendants, in exchange for, amongst other things, the protection of their PHI/PII and financial information.

132. Representative Plaintiff and Class Members fully performed their obligations under the implied contracts with Defendant.

133. Defendants breached the implied contracts they made with Representative Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to safeguard and protect their PHI/PII and financial information and by failing to provide timely and accurate notice to them that their PHI/PII and financial information was compromised as a result of the Data Breach.

134. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' above-described breach of implied contract, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered (and will continue to suffer) (a) ongoing, imminent, and impending threat of identity theft crimes, fraud, and abuse, resulting in monetary loss and economic harm; (b) actual identity theft crimes, fraud, and abuse, resulting in monetary loss and economic harm; (c) loss of the confidentiality of the stolen confidential data; (d) the illegal sale of the compromised data on the dark web; (e) lost work time; and (f) other economic and non-economic harm.

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Unfair Business Practices
(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code, §17200, *et seq*.)
(On behalf of the California Subclass)

135. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

136. Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members further bring this cause of action, seeking equitable and statutory relief to stop the misconduct of Defendant, as complained of herein.

137. Defendants have engaged in unfair competition within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, because Defendants' conduct is unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent, as herein alleged.

138. Representative Plaintiff, the California Subclass Members, and Defendants are each a "person" or "persons" within the meaning of § 17201 of the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL").

139. The knowing conduct of Defendant, as alleged herein, constitutes an unlawful and/or fraudulent business practice, as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208. Specifically, Defendants conducted business activities while failing to comply with the legal mandates cited herein, including HIPAA. Such violations include, but are not necessarily limited to:

a. failure to maintain adequate computer systems and data security practices to safeguard PHI/PII and financial information;

b. failure to disclose that their computer systems and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard PHI/PII and financial information from theft;

c. failure to timely and accurately disclose the Data Breach to Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members;

d. continued acceptance of PHI/PII and financial information and storage of other personal information after Defendants knew or should have known of the security vulnerabilities of the systems that were exploited in the Data Breach; and

e. continued acceptance of PHI/PII and financial information and storage of other personal information after Defendants knew or

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

should have known of the Data Breach and before they allegedly remediated the Data Breach.

140. Defendants knew, or should have known, that their computer systems and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard the PHI/PII and financial information of Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members, deter hackers, and detect a breach within a reasonable time and that the risk of a data breach was highly likely.

141. In engaging in these unlawful business practices, Defendants have enjoyed an advantage over their competition and a resultant disadvantage to the public and California Subclass Members.

142. Defendants' knowing failure to adopt policies in accordance with and/or adhere to these laws, all of which are binding upon and burdensome to Defendants' competitors, engenders an unfair competitive advantage for Defendant, thereby constituting an unfair business practice, as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208.

143. Defendants have clearly established a policy of accepting a certain amount of collateral damage, as represented by the damages to Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members herein alleged, as incidental to their business operations, rather than accept the alternative costs of full compliance with fair, lawful, and honest business practices ordinarily borne by responsible competitors of Defendants and as set forth in legislation and the judicial record.

144. The UCL is, by their express terms, a cumulative remedy, such that remedies under their provisions can be awarded in addition to those provided under separate statutory schemes and/or common law remedies, such as those alleged in the other causes of action of this Complaint. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17205.

145. Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members request that this Court enter such orders or judgments as may be necessary to enjoin Defendants from continuing their unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices and to restore to

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

Representative Plaintiff and California Subclass Members any money Defendants acquired by unfair competition, including restitution and/or equitable relief, including disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, refunds of moneys, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and the costs of prosecuting this class action, as well as any and all other relief that may be available at law or equity.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Representative Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and each member of the proposed National Class and the California Subclass, respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in his favor and for the following specific relief against Defendants as follows:

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that this action is a proper class action and certify each of the proposed classes and/or any other appropriate subclasses under F.R.C.P. Rule 23 (b)(1), (b)(2), and/or (b)(3), including appointment of Representative Plaintiff's counsel as Class Counsel;

2. For an award of damages, including actual, nominal, and consequential damages, as allowed by law in an amount to be determined;

3. That the Court enjoin Defendant, ordering them to cease and desist from unlawful activities in further violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.;

4. For equitable relief enjoining Defendants from engaging in the wrongful conduct complained of herein pertaining to the misuse and/or disclosure of Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII/PHI, and from refusing to issue prompt, complete, any accurate disclosures to Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

5. For injunctive relief requested by Representative Plaintiff, including but not limited to, injunctive and other equitable relief as is necessary to protect the

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

interests of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, including but not limited to an Order:

a. prohibiting Defendants from engaging in the wrongful and unlawful acts described herein;

b. requiring Defendants to protect, including through encryption, all data collected through the course of business in accordance with all applicable regulations, industry standards, and federal, state or local laws;

c. requiring Defendants to delete and purge the PII/PHI of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members unless Defendants can provide to the Court reasonable justification for the retention and use of such information when weighed against the privacy interests of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

d. requiring Defendants to implement and maintain a comprehensive Information Security Program designed to protect the confidentiality and integrity of Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII/PHI;

e. requiring Defendants to engage independent third-party security auditors and internal personnel to run automated security monitoring, simulated attacks, penetration tests, and audits on Defendants' systems on a periodic basis;

f. prohibiting Defendants from maintaining Representative Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII/PHI on a cloud-based database;

g. requiring Defendants to segment data by creating firewalls and access controls so that, if one area of Defendants' network is compromised, hackers cannot gain access to other portions of Defendants' systems;

h. requiring Defendants to conduct regular database scanning and securing checks;

i. requiring Defendants to establish an information security training program that includes at least annual information security training for all employees, with additional training to be provided as appropriate based upon the employees' respective responsibilities with handling PII/PHI, as well as protecting the PII/PHI of Representative Plaintiff and Class Members;

j. requiring Defendants to implement a system of tests to assess their respective employees' knowledge of the education programs discussed in the preceding subparagraphs, as well as randomly and periodically testing employees' compliance with Defendants' policies, programs, and systems for protecting personal identifying information;

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

k. requiring Defendants to implement, maintain, review, and revise as necessary a threat management program to appropriately monitor Defendants' networks for internal and external threats, and assess whether monitoring tools are properly configured, tested, and updated;

l. requiring Defendants to meaningfully educate all Class Members about the threats that they face as a result of the loss of their confidential personal identifying information to third parties, as well as the steps affected individuals must take to protect themselves.

6. For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded, at the prevailing legal rate;

7. For an award of attorneys' fees, costs, and litigation expenses, as allowed by law;

8. For a finding that Defendants Don Lomas and Steve Terui are liable for the debts and liabilities of Clinivate, LLC.

9. For all other Orders, findings, and determinations identified and sought in this Complaint.

JURY DEMAND

Representative Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Plaintiff Class(es) and/or Subclass(es), hereby demands a trial by jury for all issues triable by jury.

Dated: November 23, 2022

COLE & VAN NOTE

By: */s/ Cody A. Bolce*
Cody A. Bolce, Esq.
Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Classes

COLE & VAN NOTE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800